

of each route of the pipeline; and (4) the impact on regional stability of the pipeline along each route.

The oil-rich Transcaucasus region that stretches between the Southern border of the Russian Federation and Iran is of great geostrategic interest to the United States. Development of an oil pipeline through Azerbaijan, Armenia and Turkey or Georgia would provide the countries in the Transcaucasus with economic access outside Russian or Iranian control. The committee believes that such a pipeline would help ensure that Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia remain strong and independent nations while simultaneously providing the United States with a major source of petroleum outside of the Persian Gulf.

Section 512.—Reports on eradication of production and trafficking in narcotic drugs and marijuana

Section 512 requires the President to submit a semiannual report to Congress on the progress made by the United States in eradicating production of and trafficking in illicit drugs. The report shall be submitted in unclassified form with a classified annex, if required.

Section 513.—Reports on commercial disputes with Pakistan

Section 513 requires the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, to report 30 days after the bill's enactment, and every 90 days thereafter, on the status of disputes between the Government of Pakistan and United States persons with respect to cellular telecommunications and on the progress of efforts to resolve such disputes. The requirement to submit the report shall terminate upon certification by the Secretary of State to Congress that all significant disputes between the Government of Pakistan and United States persons with respect to cellular communications have been satisfactorily resolved.

In other sections of this bill, the committee broadened the Pressler amendment to allow, among other things, for United States trade and investment programs in Pakistan. However, the committee believes that United States companies should enjoy a friendly business atmosphere in Pakistan, without which further development of economic relations will be difficult.

Section 514.—Nonproliferation and disarmament fund

Section 514 authorizes \$25 million for each of the fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund [NDF]. The NDF supplements United States diplomatic efforts to halt the spread of both weapons of mass destruction and advanced conventional weapons, their delivery systems, and related weapons and their means of delivery.

Under authority provided in section 504 of the Freedom for Russia and Emerging Eurasian Democracies and Open Markets Support Act of 1992 (Freedom Support Act), significant accomplishments in furthering these nonproliferation and disarmament goals have been made. The NDF has, for example, assisted in the purchase of unsafeguarded highly enriched uranium from Kazakhstan, the destruction of Hungarian SCUD missiles, and work on deploying seismic arrays in Egypt and Pakistan necessary to test a global network to verify a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The NDF seeks bilateral and multilateral project proposals that dismantle and destroy existing weapons of mass destruction, their components and delivery systems, that strengthen international safeguards and delivery systems, that strengthen international safeguards, and that improve export controls and nuclear smuggling efforts.

Beginning in fiscal year 1996, the NDF will assume responsibility for export control assistance to the Newly Independent States [NIS]. This assistance has been provided by the Department of Defense in earlier legislation authorized under the Nunn-Lugar Comprehensive Threat Reduction Program.

The committee believes the NDF is an important element in achieving the high priority national security and foreign policy goal of slowing and reversing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and advanced conventional weapons.

Section 515.—Russian nuclear technology agreement with Iran

Section 515 expresses the sense of Congress regarding Russia's nuclear agreement with Iran. The Committee is profoundly concerned about an agreement between Russia and Iran to sell nuclear power reactors to Iran. It is the sense of this Committee that the Russian Federation should be strongly condemned if it continues a commercial agreement to provide Iran with nuclear technology which would assist that country in its development of nuclear weapons. Moreover, if such a transfer occurs, Russia would be ineligible for assistance under the terms of the Freedom Support Act.

During the May 1995 summit in Moscow, Russian President Yeltsin was asked by President Clinton to cancel the reactor sale to Iran. President Yeltsin did not halt the sale, but instead cancelled the Russian sale of a gas centrifuge to Iran and halted the training of 10 to 20 Iranian scientists a year in Moscow.

Iran is aggressively pursuing a nuclear-weapons acquisition program. The Central Intelligence Agency stated in September 1994 that Iran probably could, with some foreign help, acquire a nuclear weapons capability within 8 to 10 years. Iran is receiving that foreign help from Russia and China. Specifically, China is helping Iran build a nuclear research reactor, and in April it concluded a deal to sell Iran two light-water reactors. Pakistan, a country with . . .

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the nearly unanimous action by the Foreign Relations Committee is only a first step. Most importantly, there remains \$1.4 billion worth of military equipment which Pakistan bought and paid for but which has never been delivered because of existing restrictions. President Clinton himself has said this situation is "not fair to Pakistan." On behalf of a country that has been one of our closest allies throughout the cold war, the United States must rectify this circumstance.

I am certain the administration is developing alternatives, and I stand ready to work with them to ensure that our relationship with our close ally is able to move forward. Pakistan deserves fair treatment. ●

PAUL BRUHN—1995 HARRIS AWARD WINNER

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, early last month, Paul Bruhn of South Burlington, Vermont, received the 1995 Harris Award. Paul is the Executive Director of the Preservation Trust of Vermont, and I know that he was given the Award because of his life-long devotion to improving the Burlington area and helping Vermont in all things. He was recognized as the Downtown

Business Person of the Year, and the honor is justly deserved.

During the past 20 years, I cannot remember a thing done to help Burlington that did not involve Paul Bruhn. Those of us who think of Burlington as home know how much we owe to Paul. I ask that two articles from the Burlington Free Press regarding Paul, be printed in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Burlington Free Press, May 5, 1995]

ARCHITECT, CONSULTANT HONORED

(By Stacey Chase)

Breaking with tradition, the Downtown Burlington Development Association has announced the winners of the Nathan Harris and Hertz Pasackow awards that will be presented at the association's annual dinner May 11.

The 1995 Harris Award will be given to Paul Bruhn, executive director of the Non-profit Preservation Trust of Vermont and a private public affairs consultant. This year's Pasackow Award goes to Bob Miller for the development of his namesake building, Miller's Landmark, on the Church Street Marketplace.

"I was surprised, flattered, a little embarrassed but very appreciative," said Bruhn, 48, of South Burlington.

The Harris Award has been given since 1978 to the person "who best emulates the enthusiasm, dedication and foresight of Nate Harris in maintaining and improving the economic vitality of the Burlington central business district."

"Paul Bruhn has been involved and concerned with the vitality of downtown Burlington all of his life," said Ed Moore, executive director of the development association. "And the interesting part of Paul's accomplishment and contribution is that he's never in the limelight; he's always been behind the scenes working very, very hard."

The Pasackow Award has been given since 1984 for significant contribution to the physical or architectural quality of downtown Burlington. Miller's Landmark contains 15 stores and office space.

"When J.C. Penny chose to leave the city, the thought of a vacant shell of a building caused concern for many in downtown," Moore said. "Then Bobby Miller purchased the building, created a vision and began implementation of a plan that is represented by that building as we know it today."

Miller, 59, of Shelburne is president of REM Development Co. The Williston company is a commercial and industrial development firm.

"I think the building certainly has increased the identity of that upper block," Miller said. "And it's been kind of a fun project."

Both Harris and Pasackow were founding members of the development association. The late Nathan Harris started Nate's men's clothing store; the late Hertz Pasackow started Mayfair women's clothing store.

Moore said the decision to announce the winner before the annual dinner was made this year to give the recipients greater recognition for their work.

"We thought we could get a better turnout if people knew," Moore said.

[From the Burlington Free Press, May 12, 1995]

PASACKOW, HARRIS AWARDS GIVEN

(By Candy Page)

In a bittersweet moment Thursday evening, the Pasackow family, whose Church Street clothing store is closing, presented

the H. Hertz Pasackow Award to Robert Miller of Miller's Landmark, one of downtown's newest businesses.

The award, for architectural excellence, was one of two presented by the Downtown Burlington Development Association to downtown leaders.

The audience of 200 gave a standing ovation to Paul Bruhn, who received the Nate Harris Award as the downtown businessperson of the year.

Bruhn, executive director of the Preservation Trust of Vermont, was recognized for 20 years of behind-the-scenes work in helping to create the Church Street Marketplace and to keep it strong.

"I'm proud to have been part of this Marketplace," Jay Pasackow said as he presented the Pasackow award to Miller.

Pasackow said Miller's \$3.5 million renovation of the former J.C. Penny building meant that "what was potential urban decay became a jewel for downtown."

Miller said he was sad the Pasackow family is closing their business but that he is excited about the Marketplace's future.

Bruhn's work has been less visible than Miller's.

As an aide to Sen. Patrick J. Leahy in the 1970s, Bruhn helped obtain the seven federal grants that helped finance creation of the Church Street pedestrian mall.

Mayor Peter Clavelle praised Bruhn for more recent work, organizing opposition to suburban mega-developments like Wal-Mart and Pyramid mall.

"Paul has been the most persistent and effective organizer of opposition to Pyramid and Wal-Mart . . . and downtown Burlington would not be what it is today if Pyramid or Wal-Mart had been built," the mayor said.●

NATO EXPANSION

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, one of the critical national security issues that the Senate, and indeed the Nation, is currently facing is the future of the North Atlantic Alliance. NATO, which has been the bedrock of European peace and stability for almost 50 years, is in a period of transition—adjusting to the realities of the post-cold war world. Key among the issues confronting NATO is its possible expansion to include the nations of Central and Eastern Europe, and, possibly, the states of the former Soviet Union.

Last Thursday, June 22, Senator NUNN addressed this issue in a speech to the Supreme Allied Command Atlantic [SACLANT] conference in my State at Norfolk, VA. I have enormous respect for the views of Senator NUNN, my friend and colleague for 17 years in the Senate. We have traveled together extensively and jointly worked on projects such as the Nunn-Warner Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers, currently located in Washington, DC and Moscow.

He is recognized around the world as an expert on national security issues, and in particular on issues related to NATO. While I might not agree with all of the points made in Senator NUNN's speech on NATO expansion, it is a very thoughtful contribution to this important international dialog. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and I ask that the text of Senator NUNN's speech be printed in the RECORD.

The text of the speech follows:

THE FUTURE OF NATO IN AN UNCERTAIN WORLD

(By Senator Sam Nunn)

1. INTRODUCTION: THE IMPORTANCE OF NATO ENLARGEMENT

Thank you, General Sheehan, for your kind introduction. Secretary General Claes, NATO Military Committee Chairman Field Marshal Vincent, distinguished NATO ambassadors, distinguished military commanders, distinguished guests, I am honored to be with you this morning to discuss the role of NATO in the post Cold War period.

The pivotal issue of NATO expansion deserves thorough and careful consideration, because it has important ramifications: for the future of NATO; for the countries of central and eastern Europe; for the future of Russia and the other countries of the former Soviet Union; and for the future security and order throughout Europe, east and west.

II. NEW SECURITY SITUATION

NATO was established primarily to protect the Western democracies from an expansionist Soviet Union that seemed determined to spread its influence through subversion, political intimidation and the threat of military force.

When NATO was formed in the late 1940's, Europe was faced with postwar devastation and the emergence of Soviet aggression and confrontation. Western consensus developed around two critical concepts that were decisive in winning the Cold War and in winning the peace: First, Germany and Japan should not be isolated but should be integrated into the community of democratic nations. Second, the western democracies should pursue together a policy of containment, and unite in NATO to carry out this policy.

Integration and containment succeeded; The Berlin Wall is down and Germany is united. Eastern Europe and the Baltics are free at last. The Soviet Empire has disintegrated and Russia is struggling to try to establish a market economy and some semblance of democracy.

For almost half a century, NATO's military strength was our defensive shield against aggression by the Soviet Union, but our offensive sword was our free societies, our innovative and energetic peoples, our free market systems and our free flow of ideas.

With the end of the Cold War, we have witnessed a heart-pounding, terrain-altering set of earthquakes centered in the former Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe. These seismic events have ended an international era.

The European security environment has changed. We have moved from a world of high risk, but also high stability because of the danger of escalation and balance of terror, to a world of much lower risk but must less stability. In a strange and even tragic sense, the world has been made safer for racial, ethnic, class and religious vengeance, savagery and civil war. Such tragedy has come to the people of Bosnia, Somalia, Haiti, Rwanda, Burundi, Liberia, Sudan, Tajikistan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, and many others.

The dust has not settled. Bosnia continues to erode NATO's credibility and confidence. Yet it is clear that the overall security and freedom of Europe has dramatically improved.

The Eastern European countries, the Baltic countries, and many of the countries of the former Soviet Union have become fully independent, are turning westward, and are anxious to become part of the European community and to join NATO as full members.

We are no longer preoccupied with the crucial Cold War issue of how much warning

time NATO would have in advance of a massive conventional attack westward by the Warsaw Pact.

During the Cold War, we worried about a Soviet invasion deep into Western Europe. As Michael Mandelbaum points out, the current debacle in Chechnya indicates that Russia today has serious trouble invading itself.

Today, our military planners estimate that preparation for a Russian conventional military attack, even against Eastern Europe, would take several years at a minimum—assuming the resources could be found to rebuild the undermanned, underfunded, poorly trained and poorly disciplined Russian military establishment.

Russia itself has gone from being the center of a menacing, totalitarian global empire to an economically-weak, psychologically-troubled country struggling to move toward democracy and a market-based economy.

A multilateral security system is forming across Europe that reduces nuclear and conventional armaments and makes a surprise attack by Russian conventional military forces toward the West increasingly unlikely.

I have in mind the cumulative effect of such agreements as the INF Treaty, the CFE Treaty, the unilateral U.S. and Soviet decisions to reduce tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, the START I and pending START II Treaties, and the pending Chemical Weapons Convention and Open Skies Treaty.

These mechanisms are far from perfect, several await ratification, and they require vigorous verification and full implementation. Yet even at this stage, they significantly enhance warning time that today is measured in years rather than in days or in months.

We are all aware of the dramatic change in the threat environment in Europe resulting from these changes.

The immediate danger is posed by violent terrorist groups; by isolated rogue states, by ethnic, religious, and other types of sub-national passion that can flare into vicious armed conflict. The lethality of any and all of these threats can be greatly magnified by the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, as well as by the spread of destabilizing conventional weapons.

This audience is well aware that Russia currently possesses over 20,000 nuclear weapons, at least 40 thousand tons of chemical weapons, advanced biological warfare capabilities, hundreds of tons of fissile material, huge stores of conventional weapons, plus thousands of scientists and technicians skilled in manufacturing weapons of mass destruction.

This is the first time in history that an empire has disintegrated while possessing such enormous destructive capabilities. Even if these capabilities are greatly reduced, the know-how, the production capability, and the dangers of proliferation will endure for many years. This is the number one security threat for America, for NATO, and for the world.

As we contemplate NATO enlargement, we must carefully measure its effect on this proliferation threat.

In the longer term, we cannot dismiss the possibility of a resurgent and threatening Russia.

Russia not only has inherited the still dangerous remnants of the Soviet war machine. In addition, even in its currently weakened condition, Russia possesses great potential in human and material resources. By virtue of its size and strategic location, Russia exerts considerable weight in Europe, Asia and the Middle East. Meanwhile, Russia has inherited the USSR's veto power in the UN Security Council and therefore has a major voice in multilateral decision making.